



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/828,811	04/21/2004	Mairead Lyons	56011-3	7263
7590 11/26/2008				
Brian L. Michaelis Seyfarth Shaw LLP Two Seaport Lane Suite 300 Boston, MA 02210-2028				
EXAMINER				
LOVEL, KIMBERLY M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2167				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/26/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/828,811

Applicant(s)

LYONS ET AL.

Examiner

KIMBERLY LOVEL

Art Unit

2167

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 August 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 22-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 22-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This communication is in response to the Amendment filed 28 August 2008.
2. Claims 22-40 are currently pending and claims 1-21 are canceled. In the Amendment filed 28 August 2008, claims 22-32, 39 and 40 have been amended. This action is made Final.
3. The rejections of claims 22-30, 33-36 and 38-40 as being unpatentable over US PGPub 2004/0186821 to Matson et al in view of US PGPub 2005/0160014 to Moss et al and of claims 31, 32 and 37 as being unpatentable over US PGPub 2004/0186821 to Matson et al in view of US PGPub 2005/0160014 to Moss et al and further in view of US Patent No 6,633,878 to Underwood have been maintained.

Claim Objections

4. The objections to **claims 39 and 40** are withdrawn as necessitated by applicant's amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

5. The rejections of **claims 20-32** under 35 U.S.C. 101 are withdrawn as necessitated by applicant's amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. **Claims 22-30, 33-36 and 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US PGPub 2004/0186821 to Matson et al (hereafter Matson) in view of US PGPub 2005/0160014 to Moss et al (hereafter Moss).**

Referring to claim 22, Matson discloses a computer system including at least one processor and memory, for processing expense information, the system comprising:

a generic file parser [process 211] adapted to receive said expense information from a plurality of expense data providers [sources 101, 103 and 105], wherein said expense information includes data in a plurality of formats (see [0031]; [0037] and [0038]);

at least one specific parsing module corresponding to at least one of said plurality of formats, the specific parsing module(s) being adapted to overwrite functions of the generic file parser which are not suited for a format of said plurality of formats corresponding to the respective specific parsing modules (see [0037] and [0038]);

at least one extension of a specific parsing module, the at least one extension being adapted to process specific fields of said expense information (see [0037] and [0038]).

However, Matson fail to explicitly disclose the further limitation of sorting the parsed data into a plurality of temporary tables. Moss discloses the insertion of transactional data into a database, including the further limitation of sorting the parsed data into a plurality of temporary tables [staging tables] (see [0465]) in order to increase efficiency by avoiding feeding data into a data import process without having a thorough understanding of data beforehand.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to load the XML file data of Matson into the staging tables as disclosed by Moss. One would have been motivated to do so in order to increase efficiency by avoiding feeding data into a data import process without having a thorough understanding of data beforehand (Matson: see [0035], lines 10-12).

Referring to claim 23, the combination of Matson and Moss (hereafter Matson/Moss) discloses the computer system of claim 22, wherein the generic file parser is adapted to process said expense information that is received in a generic format; and wherein said specific fields that are to be processed by said extensions do not agree with the generic format (Matson: see [0037] and [0038]).

Referring to claim 24, Matson/Moss discloses the computer system of claim 22, further comprising:

an incoming data receiving component [IM 107], to connect to a source of data [sources 101, 103 and 105] and receive incoming data (Matson: see [0031]);

a loader component, in communication with said parsing component, to receive parsed data from said parsing component, and to sort said parsed data [stores in XML file 215] (Matson: see [0039], lines 1-3) into a plurality of temporary tables (Moss: see [0465]) as a function of said plurality of fields (Matson: see [0037]);

a data sorting component [data load technician] in communication with said plurality of temporary tables and with said database to access sorted data in said plurality of temporary tables, and to re-sort said sorted data into a plurality of tables [files] in said database [database 111] (Matson: see [0059]-[0060]; Moss: see [0037]).

Referring to claim 25, Matson/Moss discloses the computer system of claim 25 wherein said loader component – processes said parsed data into a proper format [XML] for insertion into said database [database 111] (Matson: see [0036]-[0037], lines 1-3);

stores said parsed data in a file [supplier XML file 215] (see [0039], lines 3-8);

said loader component being further configured to deactivate access to a temporary table in said database (Moss: see [0465]) and load said file into said temporary table in said database (Moss: see [0465]) and thereafter re-activate access to said temporary table (Moss: see [0465]).

Referring to claim 26, Matson/Moss discloses computer the system of claim 24 wherein said data sorting component also inserts relational link information in said

plurality of tables in said database [loading relational data into database 111] (Matson: see [0035], lines 7-10).

Referring to claim 27, Matson/Moss discloses the computer system of claim 24 wherein said data sorting component, upon accessing a data item in said temporary tables that indicates an error, moves said data item into a corresponding error table [faulty products data file] (see Matson [0043]).

Referring to claim 28, Matson/Moss discloses the computer system of claim 22 wherein at least one specific function is implemented into a specific parsing component which encapsulates said generic parsing component, said at least one specific function modifying functionality of said generic parsing component so that said specific parsing component can parse data in a specific format (Matson: see [0038]).

Referring to claim 29, Matson/Moss discloses the computer system of claim 28 wherein said at least one specific function overrides corresponding functionality in said generic parsing component (Matson: see [0038]).

Referring to claim 30, Matson/Moss discloses the computer system of claim 24 wherein said data sorting component processes data in terms of one of: transaction data [product transactions] (Matson: see [0023]), line item data, additional data, enhanced data, trip leg data, and card balance data.

Referring to claim 33, Matson discloses a method for processing expense information comprising:

providing a generic file parser [process 211] adapted to receive said expense information from a plurality of expense data providers [sources 101, 103 and 105],

wherein said expense information includes data in a plurality of formats (see [0031]; [0037] and [0038]);

providing at least one specific parsing module corresponding to at least one of said plurality of formats, the specific parsing module(s) being adapted to overwrite functions of the generic file parser which are not suited for a format of said plurality of formats corresponding to the respective specific parsing modules (see [0037] and [0038]);

receiving said expense information from said plurality of expense data providers (see [0031]);

said generic file parser [process 211] parsing said expense information as a function of a plurality of fields [supplier name, supplier product number, etc] to form parsed data (see [0037]);

a data sorting component [data load technician] to re-sort said sorted data into a plurality of tables [files] in said database [database 111] (see [0059]-[0060]); and

resorting and inserting said sorted data into tables in a database (see [0059]-[0060]).

However, Matson fail to explicitly disclose the further limitation of sorting the parsed data into a plurality of temporary tables. Moss discloses the insertion of transactional data into a database, including the further limitation of sorting the parsed data into a plurality of temporary tables [staging tables] (see [0465]) in order to increase efficiency by avoiding feeding data into a data import process without having a thorough understanding of data beforehand.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to load the XML file data of Matson into the staging tables as disclosed by Moss. One would have been motivated to do so in order to increase efficiency by avoiding feeding data into a data import process without having a thorough understanding of data beforehand (Matson: see [0035], lines 10-12).

Referring to claim 34, Matson/Moss discloses the method of claim 33 wherein said step of sorting said parsed data into a plurality of temporary tables includes:

processing said data into a proper format [XML] for insertion as formatted data into said database [database 111] (Matson: see [0036]-[0037], lines 1-3);

storing said formatted data in a file [supplier XML file 215] (see [0039], lines 3-8);

deactivating access to a temporary table in said database (Moss: see [0465]);

loading said formatted data from said file into said temporary table in said database (Moss: see [0465]); and

re-activating access to said data table (Moss: see [0465]).

Referring to claim 35, Matson/Moss discloses the method of claim 33 further including:

during said step of inserting said sorted data into tables in said database, inserting relational link information in said plurality of tables in said database [loading relational data into database 111] (Matson: see [0035], lines 7-10).

Referring to claim 36, Matson/Moss discloses the method of claim 33 wherein said step of re-sorting and inserting said sorted data into tables in said database

includes: if a data item indicates an error, moving said data item into a corresponding error table in said database [faulty products data file] (see Matson [0043]).

Referring to claim 38, Matson/Moss discloses the method of claim 8 wherein said step of parsing said data includes:

providing a generic parsing process, said generic parsing process including common functionality to parse data (Matson: see [0037]); and

providing a set of specific function to be implemented in a specific parsing process which encapsulates said generic parsing process, said set of specific functions modifying said generic parsing process so said generic parsing process includes functionality to parse data according to said specific set of functions (Matson: see [0038]).

Referring to claim 39, Matson/Moss discloses the method of claim 38 wherein said set of specific functions overrides corresponding functionality in said generic parsing component (Matson: see [0038]).

Referring to claim 40, Matson/Moss discloses the method of claim 33 wherein said step re-sorting and inserting said sorted data into tables in said database includes processing said sorted data in terms of one of transaction data [product transactions] (Matson: see [0023]), line item data, additional data, enhanced data, trip leg data, and card balance data.

8. Claims 31, 32 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US PGPub 2004/0186821 to Matson et al in view of US PGPub 2005/0160014 to Moss et al as applied respectively to claims 22 and 33 above, and further in view of US Patent No 6,633,878 to Underwood (hereafter Underwood).

Referring to claims 31 and 37, Matson/Moss discloses transactions, however, Matson/Moss fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation wherein said data is transactional data representing transactions completed using a commercial credit card. Underwood discloses initializing an ecommerce database framework, including the further limitation wherein said data is transactional data representing transactions completed using a commercial credit card (see column 107, lines 56-61).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the feature of Underwood wherein commercial credit cards represent the transactions with the system of Matson/Moss. One would have been motivated to do so since Matson/Moss handles data received from real-time data feeds (Matson: see [0023], lines 3-7).

Referring to claim 32, the combination of Matson/Moss and Underwood discloses the system of claim 31 wherein said data sorting component includes additional information in said data tables regarding tax information for said transactional data (Underwood: see column 116, lines 7-17).

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed in regards to the prior art rejections have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
10. Throughout the Remarks, the applicant argues that the product data of Matson is quite different from the expense data. The examiner respectfully disagrees. The claim language fails to provide any type of limitations [functions performed on the data] that restrict the type of data. Currently, the claimed limitations would operate in the same matter without regards to the data type.
11. Referring to applicant's arguments on page 10 of the Remarks, the applicant argues that Matson fails to teach the concept of a second parsing module. The examiner respectfully disagrees. The parser of Matson parses the supplier data file into an XML file. This function can be customized for each data supplier (see [0036]). In order to have a customized parsing module for each supplier, there would have to be a plurality of extensions of the original parsing module. Therefore, Matson is considered to meet the requirements of the claimed limitation.
12. The rejections of the dependent claims are maintained for the reasons stated above.

Conclusion

13. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KIMBERLY LOVEL whose telephone number is (571)272-2750. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 - 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on (571) 272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/John R. Cottingham/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2167

Kimberly Lovel
Examiner
Art Unit 2167

21 November 2008
kml